



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Advocate of Peace

VOL. LXXVIII

JULY, 1916

NUMBER 7

DEMOCRATS, REPUBLICANS, AND PEACE

THE most significant utterance to be found in either of the political platforms is the following Republican confession of faith. It is the last sentence of the paragraph entitled "Protection of American Rights." It reads:

"We believe in the pacific settlement of international disputes and favor the establishment of a world court for that purpose."

The utterance of the Democratic party upon the problem of the pacifists is not so definite. It is true that they say:

"The people of the United States love peace. They respect the rights and covet the friendship of all other nations. They desire neither any additional territory nor any advantage which cannot be peacefully gained by their skill, their industry or their enterprise. . . . We hold that it is the duty of the United States . . . to assist the world in securing settled peace and justice . . . and we believe that the time has come when it is the duty of the United States to join with

the other nations of the world in any feasible association that will effectively serve these principles, to maintain inviolate the complete security of the highway of the seas for the common and unhindered use of all nations."

As between these two interpretations of the best way out of the present world difficulty, we professional pacifists will especially welcome the Republican statement. The writer of that statement has wittingly or unwittingly embodied one-half of the program of the American Peace Society for nearly a century. So far as we know, this is the first time in the history of political parties that this program has been so definitely stated in a great national political platform. This is, indeed, heartening. The politicians and statesmen are learning at last what the pacifists are after. It will not be long before they will sense the other half of our program, namely, the extension of our international law-making machinery into a more effective agency. The peace-makers may well be encouraged.

MORE "PROFITABLE PATRIOTISM"

CONGRESSMAN QUIN, of Mississippi, speaking before the Congress Wednesday, May 31, referred to the record of the Armor-Plate Trust, calling particular attention to the time when "they bored holes in the armor and put defective material in the battleships." He called attention also to the fact that those opposing the Government manufacture of armor plate were, for the most part, directly or indirectly interested in great steel corporations and the trusts engaged in the manufacture of armor plate. The proof shows, he said, that they charged three prices to the American Government, and that is exploitation and plunder. He added:

"The rifles that the Government manufactures cost \$16, and those that they have been buying from private factories cost \$27—identically the same gun. This machine gun which you have read about, that weighs 32 pounds, cost \$1,200, purchased from private factories. As to the little tripod and the pack that goes on the mule's back, great statesmen on that committee inquiring about it discovered that a tripod that Sears & Roebuck, of the gentlemen's own town, would supply for about 30 cents, is supplied by this gun manufacturer at \$300, and that the little pack that goes on the mule's

back costs the Government \$500 at the hands of a private factory. Any man who ever used a shotgun, and who is a judge of arms, knows that the machine gun, weighing 32 pounds, and a little tripod or pair of tongs to hold it up, is worth about \$75, but, manufactured by these people and sold to Uncle Sam, it costs the taxpayers of this Republic \$1,200! Mr. Chairman, the failure to pass this provision in the bill would be a reflection on the integrity of this House. We must take the profit out of war guns, ammunition, and armor plate."

Senator Robert M. La Follette's editorial, in which he charges that the Government arsenal at Philadelphia is today making a 3.8-inch common shrapnel at a cost of only \$7.94, while at the same time it is paying private firms for the identical shrapnel exactly \$17.50, has, so far as we know, never been answered. More of the Senator's editorial deserves requotation. We read:

"The Government makes a 31-second combination fuse for \$2.92. For this same fuse it pays the private maker just \$7.00. The Government makes a 3-inch finished shrapnel case at a cost of only \$1.75. It pays the private manufacturing concern \$3.06 for the same article. The Government makes a gun carriage for a 3-

inch rifled field gun at exactly \$2,510.60. It pays the private manufacturer \$3,398.82 for the same gun carriage. The Government has manufactured caissons for \$1,128.67, and it has paid private concerns \$1,744.10 for the same caisson. The Government filled one of its own orders for ammunition at its own arsenal which cost \$1,900,064. It saved on this order \$979,840, for it would have cost exactly \$2,879,904 if filled by private manufacturers.

Article.	Purchase price from private firms.	Cost of manufacture at Government plant.	Profit.
3.8-inch common shrapnel	\$17.50	\$7.94	\$9.56
31-second combination fuse....	7.00	2.92	4.08
3-inch finished shrapnel case..	3.06	1.75	1.31
Gun-carriages for 3-inch rifles...	3,398.82	2,510.60	888.22
Caissons	1,744.10	1,128.67	615.43
Order ammunition	2,879,904.00	1,900,064.00	979,840.00

For every fiscal year, at least for a decade, the United States Government has spent upon its navy many millions more than any other nation of the world save Great Britain. For the fiscal year 1914-15, for example, the United States spent upon its navy \$141,872,786, Germany \$113,993,329, France \$123,828,872, Russia \$128,954,733. If in the light of these facts and figures we are not relatively second among the nations of the world, there must be some fault with the patriotism of those responsible for our navy expenditures.

Those who have followed our department, *Peace and War Measures Before Congress*, must have been profoundly impressed by the number of bills providing for armor-plate plants, arsenals, naval stations, military training schools, naval training schools, aviation stations, aviation schools, extensions of navy yards and arsenals, munitions plants and gun-forging plants, many providing for indefinite appropriations, but all reaching the rather significant total of approximately \$300,000,000. Patriotism, preparedness, piffle, pretense, parade, pomposity, puffery, profits, and pork—well, it must be agreed that they alliterate.

Evidence is plentiful that a tremendous amount of money has been wasted upon nearly two hundred garrison posts, the vast majority of which are worse than useless. The War College itself has shown in detail where five and a half million dollars can be saved by concentrating some of these posts, and has frankly agreed that most of the army posts are "unnecessary and obsolete." Certain it is that they have not been located with any view either to invasion or strategy. There appears no explanation of this situation, except that they have been placed where they are, for the most part, that perfectly good money may reach influentially certain Congressional and Senatorial districts. A number of the posts were established years ago for protection against the Indians or to meet conditions which existed half a century ago, and which no longer exist. It would

seem that one of the first steps in any adequate preparedness would be to promote a quicker mobilization of our army than is possible under such a scattered arrangement. But Congressional patriotism will undoubtedly try to keep the posts where they are. If these little groups of soldiers have such a profound influence upon politics, what will be the situation when the National Guard has been increased to 17,000 officers and 440,000 enlisted men, at least 800 men in every Congressional district of every State, all with guns, public funds, the power of setting up court-martials to take precedence over the civil courts, and every guardsman with a vote?

The act or practice of trafficking in the sacred things of the church was called simony. Simony brought on the Reformation and a new ecclesiastical era. The traffic in the sacred things of the State is our modern simony. Our hope is that it will bring on a reformation and a new era of a patriotism purged of the disease of private greed.

PREPAREDNESS PARADES

"P_{RE}AREDNESS" and "Adequate Defense" are purely relative terms. There are few who believe in no preparedness, in defenselessness. There are, however, many whose doctrines approach perilously close to the worst sort of Prussian militarism.

If the meaning of "preparedness" is uncertain, what is the meaning of a preparedness parade? Probably the vast majority of the paraders have not even cared to inquire with any definiteness about the condition of preparedness in this country today. They have heard generalities in abundance, but they have examined little into what our country has to prepare against or into what it is preparing for. Yet by taking their places in the parades that have been so widely exploited and extravagantly promoted, they are virtually signing a petition for more and more military preparedness, for unparalleled increases in our army, and for an annual naval bill of \$240,000,000. They are signing a document of greatest importance to themselves, and to the rest of us, which they have not carefully read.

In the minds of these marching multitudes is patriotism of a kind, of course. Pride in the history of their country is there, and the desire, perhaps, that this nation shall continue to live, that their homes may be protected from destruction. These are good things, handsome things, in measure as they are sincere. If only they were clearly and definitely envisaged, and believed in, they would be noble things. But much of this parade-preparedness-patriotism is futile. If the paraders once analyzed their motives, they would know that it is futile. They are making no real sacrifices to march. They give up nothing, not even a day's pay,